

FRASER VALLEY COLLEGE
FACULTY & STAFF ASSOCIATION

NEWSLETTER

ISSUE: 7/85

MAY, 1985

NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

WHEN? MAY 15, 1985 3.00 PM
WHERE? CHILLIWACK CAMPUS ROOM 103
COLLEGE WILL CLOSE AT 2.30 PM IN ABBOTSFORD.

ISSUES COVERED IN THIS NEWSLETTER:

- * SALARY SETTLEMENT
- * C-IEA CONVENTION 1985
- * THE SNAG WITH SEVERANCE PAY
- * OPEN LETTER TO HON. DR. P. McGEER



THANKS
TO
B.C.T.F.
↙

~ Dinner time at Education Hall ~

THE SALARY SETTLEMENT:

A large number of FSA members met in Chilliwack at 4.15 on May 2 to hear the Contract Chair explain the final offer made by the FVC Board. The salient points are:

- a) All members receive a \$450 lump sum by June 30, 1985. (Less tax of course). This represents 1-1/2% of the salary budget shared equally among members of the bargaining unit.
- b) The 1-1/2% increase will become part of the 1985-6 salary scale but will not be translated into the scale until March 30, 1986.
- c) No increments will be paid although increments do exist in the collective agreement and remain there.

(Increments would have benefitted only some of our members: the total percentage of the salary budget they represent would have exceeded the guidelines.)

The meeting expressed concern about the precedent set by abrogating increments but agreed to accept the offer.

WHAT WE HEAR ON THE GRAPEVINE...

B.C.I.T. Settlement 75 layoffs rescinded. None till end of contract. 0% increase. April 86 5% increase to a maximum of \$47,000.

Cariboo: 6 - 7 layoffs, 2 being grieved. Lab. hours reduced.

Malaspina: 4 x 4 now changed to 5 x 3 and up to 20 hours assigned duty time each week.

Capilano: 5 x 3 suggested.

East Kootenay: 6 x 3 plus 5 x 3 suggested.

Selkirk: 17 hours and proportional payment at 16.

C-IEA CONVENTION 1985

COLLEGE-INSTITUTE EDUCATORS' ASSOCIATION OF B.C. (C-IEA)
CONVENTION 1985 will be hosted by the F.S.A. at the
Abbotsford facility May 23/24. RESERVE THOSE DATES - we
are hoping for and expecting good representation from the
host college.

Detailed convention information is forthcoming. A preview of
some of the activities are:

- * Plenary session Thursday a.m. with Bill Day and
other College principals. A "responding" panel
will participate.
- * Friday closing plenary and luncheon Keynote speaker
is futurist, Ruben Nelson. His topic: "CHANGING
CONTEXT AND CHALLENGING TIMES: REFLECTIONS ON
EDUCATION IN THE FUTURE."
- * Many workshops are planned including topics which
focus on education skills, women's issues, learning
disabilities, bargaining processes, etc.
- * ENTERTAINMENT - BRITISH PUB NIGHT - THURSDAY,
following a wine and cheese from 4.30 - 6.30, we
can look forward to a rousing evening of
entertainment featuring our own - talented - Alan
Davis and company. In keeping with the theme - we
will be provided with a full meal (roast beef and
yorkshire pudding). \$10.00/person charge will
cover meal costs.

The Convention is planned mainly from the C-IEA office and a
committee made up of Professional Development chairpeople
throughout the provincial college system. A committee on
campus is also assisting with local arrangements. If you
desire more information at this time, please contact:

Kathie Rusk	Local 303
Marg Starr	313
Doug Nicol	453
David Gibson	290
Cheryl Pohl	263

It is hoped that future planning will see the C-IEA and SVI
(Society of Vocational Instructors) combine their many
efforts into one large conference.

FROM THE AGREEMENTS COMMITTEE:

We would ask you to note the following change to your contract. The Article was changed to conform to government regulation. The Committee feels the changes (underlined below) do not damage employees and may benefit them in some instances.

Article 26.14 Time Qualifications

- (b) Should the employee then return to work in the same calendar year and subsequently be absent within one month with a new and unrelated illness or injury, his entitlement to STDL is limited to the total of ninety-four (94) work days less the number of work days already utilized with the first illness or injury. However, the first thirty (30) days of STDL for the new and unrelated illness or injury will be paid at one hundred percent of full pay, with the remaining entitlement paid at seventy percent (70%) of full pay. Should the employee return to work and subsequently be absent with a new and unrelated illness or injury after one calendar month has elapsed, the employee is provided with full benefits (94 work days of entitlement).
- (c) In the event that an employee returns to work from an absence due to illness or injury, then suffers a relapse which requires a further absence from work commencing within three (3) months of the return to work, the employee's STDL benefit does not begin again. In such case, the absence is deemed to be continuous for purposes of benefits claimed under the STDL plan. If the relapse is suffered after three (3) calendar months has elapsed since returning to work, the employee is provided with full benefits (94 work days of entitlement).

Note
What is STDL?
Short Term
Disability Leave.

Ron Coreau

Quotable Quotes...

Brown's Third Law of Galloping Bureaucracy:

The volume of paper expands to fill the
available briefcases.

Edmund Brown, Gov. of California.

P.D. INFORMATION

At the Annual General Meeting, we will require nominations for two of the five F.S.A. positions on the Joint P.D. Committee. One must come from staff, the other from faculty.

Please consider standing for these positions as they are important to the smooth and cohesive running of the committee.

REQUEST FROM RECORDING SECRETARY:

Would members who attended the February 20 General Meeting and who did not sign the attendance sheet send their names in to me so that attendance can be correctly recorded in the Minutes?

This mainly applies to those who were seated in the front four or five rows where the attendance sheet did not circulate.

Judy Inouye

NOTE FROM THE GRIEVANCE CHAIR...

If you've even taken Maternity Leave from FVC, double check your Accumulated Seniority on the new list. In the past, payroll did not always credit people on Maternity Leave with the 18 weeks provided under the Maternity Protection Act.

They are now doing so routinely and will be happy to add any previously missed if you bring it to their attention.

Betty Harris

Quotable Quote...

"Where the pygmies rule, everybody else has to crouch".

Richard Mitchell, "THE GROVES OF ACADEME."

THE SNAG WITH SEVERANCE PAY

(reprinted from Mike Grenby's 'YOUR MONEY' Column)

You could well lose out on Unemployment Insurance benefits if you get severance pay when you are laid off.

Under the new UI rules, which went into effect March 31, you must now wait for benefits if you receive severance pay, vacation pay, accumulated sick leave credits and similar payments. For the past 2-1/2 years, you could go on claim for UI benefits after only a two-week waiting period, no matter how much severance and vacation pay you had coming.

Now the government has gone back to the original rules. That means your claim will be delayed by the number of weeks these payments represent. For example, if you get four months' severance pay, you will have to wait five months before going on claim. Once your payments from work have run out, you must then apply for UI benefits and meet all the normal requirements at that time. But, because the money from separation payments is not insurable, you might find you no longer qualify for UI.

There are some exceptions:

- * As long as your claim started before March 31, you come under the old rules until your claim runs out.
- * If you get severance, etc. payments on or after March 31 based on a collective or other labor-management agreement that was in force before Dec. 31, 1984, you will come under the old rules and these payments won't delay your claim for UI.
- * If you get the payments on or after March 31 based on your employer's policy about severance, etc. payments and this policy existed in writing before Dec. 31, 1984 again you come under the old rules. (This exception was added after the proposed changes were originally announced)

These latter two exceptions remain in force until the agreement expires or the policy changes, or until March 26, 1988, whichever comes first. In any case, when you are laid off you should apply for UI. If your benefits will be delayed, you will have to apply again when you become eligible to make a claim - and hope you qualify at that time for benefits.

Keep this column as a reference. Sometimes, when rules change like this, you might run into an individual who is not yet used to the new procedures. If you do have problems, ask to speak to a supervisor and don't forget you have the right to appeal all decisions.

F.S.A.
MEMBERS
NOTE

WHAT THE FUSS WAS ABOUT IN CASE YOU DIDN'T SEE THE ORIGINAL...

MONDAY MAGAZINE (VICTORIA)
Vol.11(12): March 14-20, 1985

DEAR DR. McGEER:

An open letter to Hon. Dr. Patrick McGeer, B.C.
minister of universities, science and communications:

During our meeting of Feb. 18, it became regrettably clear why the universities of B.C. have been placed in such a grave position of disadvantage compared to the other universities of Canada and major institutions in the U.S.

When my colleague from the University of Victoria, Gordon Shrimpton, and I asked you to use whatever influence you have in the government to make certain that the average 7.5 per cent increase in funds and tax credits slated for B.C.'s universities, through the federal government's Established Programs Fund (EPF), was actually passed on to the three universities by the provincial government, you retorted that we were dreaming. You claimed that the money was destined for general revenues and would be used by the government as it saw fit; that these federal funds were not granted with a specific function in mind.

Surely, it is a matter of public record that the federal government determines the size of EPF transfers on the basis of a formula with certain uses in mind, and that through the course of recent history the unwillingness of the B.C. government to contribute an appropriate portion to university funding has resulted in a situation where the breakdown has gone from theoretically 50% federal and 50% provincial funding to one where the federal government will soon be funding virtually the whole cost of universities in the province.

Your argument in response left the impression that there were too many students, faculty and universities in this province anyway, that the period of baby boom growth was over and that B.C. universities had to rationalize their programs as Princeton, Dartmouth and Yale did when their growth had peaked.

When we pointed out that our institutions were overcrowded, you retorted that we need only raise our entrance standards to rid ourselves of those who didn't belong in universities, were there for social reasons and were best dealt with by other institutions or training programs. We responded that many of our courses have already had to raise their entrance standards arbitrarily, that those other programs (e.g. O.L.I. and B.C.I.T.) had also been drastically cut, and that,

Open letter to Dr. McGeer (Contd.)

for instance at SFU, the average age of undergraduates is in the late 20s, so they could hardly be accused of being there largely for social reasons. We pointed out that B.C.'s rate of participation in universities is the second lowest in the country.

To compete in an economy where a young person can no longer depend on never-ending economic booms in logging, fishing and mining, our university-age generation must obtain university education at a rate at least equivalent to that of Ontario or the Maritimes. Your response was that we were deluded, that there were only two good universities in Ontario, Waterloo and Queen's, that those "Mickey Mouse Maritime universities" didn't count and that we had dried up the well of potential students. According to your views, it takes two components to go to university - "endowment" and "motivation" - and that everyone in B.C. with those components in appropriate measure was already attending university. You argued that the current blip in enrolment was due to the fact that in difficult economic times, people went back to university. To us it was obvious they did so in order to increase their chances of employment.

My colleague and I went on to predict that the downslide in the economy would not last forever and that if we didn't invest now in preparing our young people for management and research and development positions, we would have to import such individuals from out of province as we did in the 60's and 70's, relegating native British Columbians to less attractive, less upwardly mobile, more economically vulnerable jobs. You suggested it was cheaper and more efficient to do so.

I believe that your views reveal more about your background, your personal experience and your social position than they do about the problems that assail this province and its universities.

It requires no inordinate endowment of cortical horsepower to determine why Nova Scotia has one of the highest university participation rates in the country. In the absence of massive natural resources, the entrepreneurs of Nova Scotia have come to realize the value of university education. Your disdain for these universities notwithstanding, Nova Scotians argue that their chief export is educated brains. One of their institutions, Dalhousie, points out that it has educated more chief executives of American corporations than any other Canadian university; another, St. Francis Xavier, educated our current prime minister.

To be unable to comprehend that endowment is more than purely cerebral is a function of having been born to privileged

Open letter to Dr. McGeer (Contd.)

position, or never having had the social odds stacked against you.

To tout Princeton as a role model for B.C.'s universities is painfully revealing. Princeton serves the welfare of no general undergraduate population, regardless of financial privilege.

You are the minister charged with championing the cause of public universities, explaining and justifying their purpose to your colleagues in the cabinet who often have had little to do with them. Yet, ironically, I would wager deep down you don't believe in public universities, secretly yearning for a time when a small number of private colleges existed on the eastern seaboard for the privileged few. Given your attitudes, it is little wonder that your cabinet colleagues are suspicious, even hostile, to universities.

Although you appear to be most suited for the universities portfolio, I would argue that your attributes can be best used exclusively in the science and technology areas.

E.O. Boyanowsky, Ph.D
President,
Confederation of Faculty Assoc.
of B.C.

